

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the present application is requested in view of the amendments made herein and the following remarks.

In an Office Action mailed on June 3, 2010, claims 1, 8, 49 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Liu; claims 15-21, 28, 29, 31 and 63-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious, in view of Liu; claims 2-7, 9-12, 50-55 and 57-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Brooks; claims 14-21, 28-31 and 62-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu; and claims 22 and 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Vaynshteyn.

Regarding the § 102 rejection of independent claim 1 in view of Liu, in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single reference must teach each and every element of the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In fact, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Furthermore, in order for a reference to be anticipatory, "[its] elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *cited in* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

The present application is directed to activating devices and more particularly to an integrated detonator for use in activating explosives. An aspect of certain embodiments, as described in the present application, is an addressable chip 812. The chip 812 can be integrated with a detonator 800 and packaged inside a standard detonator housing 802. The chip 812 can be capable of signal recognition and uniquely identifying and selecting one or more explosive initiators from a set of initiators, for example.

Along those lines, Claim 1 recites a combination of features including an addressable chip mechanically and electrically connected to a transformer, wherein the capacitor, an initiator, a transformer, and the addressable chip form a unified integrated detonating unit adapted to respond to a command communicated from a remote source to activate an explosive.

In setting forth the rejection of Claim 1, the Office action proposes that the part 92 in Liu corresponds to the addressable chip referred to in Claim 1. However, upon review of Liu it seems that the chip 92 is not an addressable chip in the context of the present application and as recited

in Claim 1. For example, Liu states that the part 92 is a driver chip (column 9, line 59) and that the chip 92 is capable of generating controlling signals over a wide frequency range. Those portions of Liu describing the part 92 would not disclose or suggest to a skilled person in the art that the chip 92 is an addressable chip in the context of Claim 1 in the present application.

At least because Liu, as relied upon in the Office action, does not disclose or suggest a combination of features as recited in Claim 1 including an addressable chip, the rejection of Claim 1 in view of Liu must be withdrawn.

Should the rejection of Claim 1 be maintained in a further Office action it is requested that the Office action clearly explain where or how Liu is being interpreted to disclose each and every feature of Claim 1 including an addressable chip.

Claim 49 recites a combination of features including an addressable chip and is rejected similarly as Claim 1 in view of Liu. For at least similar reasons as those set forth for Claim 1 in regard to similar claim language, the rejection of Claim 49 should be withdrawn.

All the dependent claims should be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims and because they define additional distinguishing features.

For example, Claim 15 depends from Claim 1 and recites that the addressable chip is adapted to identify one or more initiators from a set of initiators. There is no disclosure in Liu that chip 92 is an addressable chip and certainly no disclosure of each and every feature of Claim 15 including that the chip is adapted to identify one or more initiators from a set of initiators.

Similar treatment can be applied to Claim 63.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (SHL.0296US).

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin B. McGoff/

Date: October 29, 2010

Kevin Brayton McGoff (Reg. No. 53,297)
SCHLUMBERGER RESERVOIR COMPLETIONS
14910 AIRLINE RD.
ROSHARON, TEXAS 77583
281-285-6534 [Phone]
281-285-5337 [Facsimile]